

THORNSBERRY et al
Serial No. 10/615,591

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

REMARKS

Thus, in response to the Examiner's telephone request of February 7, 2005 holding the subject matter of claims 1-13 to be non-obvious and patentably distinct from that of claims 1-14, Applicant(s) hereby elect the invention of Group I, (upon which claims 1-13 are readable) for further substantive examination.

This election is made without traverse. However, since a restriction requirement is never proper unless the restricted group of claims is patentably distinct (i.e., inter alia, non-obvious under 35 USC §103) from the elected group of claims, the Examiner is requested to insure that such patentable distinctness is present before proceeding to make the requirement final.

It is respectfully requested that the non-elected claims be retained for use with a possible divisional application.

The claim amendments are deemed to render the claims more consistent in verbiage with those of the allowed parent application 09/987,693. Entry of the amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

February 9, 2005

By: 

H. Warren Burnam, Jr.

Reg. No. 29,366

HWB:ish
1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor
Arlington, VA 22201-4714
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100